

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The following changes are being made to the drawings:

FIG. 4 – Reference numbers 39a and 39b are being swapped. Reference number 39a was previously associated with the left-side prism and reference number 39b was previously associated with the right-side prism. Now, reference number 39a is associated with the right-side prism and reference number 39b is associated with the left-side prism.

FIG. 8 - Reference numbers 41a and 41b are being swapped. Reference number 41a was previously associated with the left-side prism and reference number 41b was previously associated with the right-side prism. Now, reference number 41a is associated with the right-side prism and reference number 41b is associated with the left-side prism.

FIG. 9 – Reference number 48b is being moved to the middle edge on the right-side prism 41b. Previously, reference number 48b was associated with the middle edge on the left-side prism 41a.

FIG. 10 - Reference numbers 43a and 43b are being swapped. Reference number 43a was previously associated with the left-side prism and reference number 43b was previously associated with the right-side prism. Now, reference number 43a is associated with the right-side prism and reference number 43b is associated with the left-side prism.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

**REMARKS**

With entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-20 remain in the application. Claims 1, 5, 17, and 20 are independent Claims. Claim 4 was previously withdrawn under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

**Restriction Requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b)**

According to the Office Action mailed on December 18, 2006, a written confirmation by the Applicant to elect Claims 1-3 and 5-20 and cancel Claim 4 under a restriction requirement is required. However, the Office Action offers to withdraw the restriction requirement if the Applicants amend the preamble of Claim 4 to replace “mold” with “method.” The Applicants are amending the preamble of Claim 4 as instructed and respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

**Objections to the Drawing**

In the Office Action, Figs. 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are objected to because certain reference numbers in Figs. 4, 8, and 10 are incorrectly positioned based on the indicated sectional views from Figs. 3, 9, and 11, respectively. Fig. 9 is further objected to because reference character 48b should be pointing to middle edge of prism element 41b. The Applicants are amending Figs. 4, 8, 9, and 10 to correct the errors. The amendments do not add new matter. The Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that “[i]ndependent claim 5 is deficient method steps and the scope of the claim is unclear as a

result.” The Office Action also states that “[t]he apex [or vertex], the first end point, and a first base point are *collinear* and not coplanar” as recited in independent Claims 1, 5, 17, and 20.

The Applicants are amending Claim 5 to define method steps.

The Applicants respectfully disagree that “the apex [or vertex], the first end point, and a first base point are collinear and not coplanar.” Any three points define a plane, so the three claimed points (“the apex [or vertex], the first end point, and a first base point”) are, by definition, coplanar. Therefore, “coplanar” is a proper description of the orientation of the “the apex [or vertex], the first end point, and a first base point.”

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

David J. Thibodeau, Jr.

Registration No. 31,671

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 5/14/07